FILED: NEW YORK COUNTY CLERK 06/09/2022 10:42 AM

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 32

INDEX NO. 652567/2020

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 06/08/2022

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
COUNTY OF NEW YORK: COMMERCIAL DIVISION PART 53

	X	N PART 53		
ALBERT BEHLER	^	INDEX NO.	652567/2020	
	Plaintiff,	MOTION DATE	10/07/2020	
- KAI-SHING TAO,	V -	MOTION SEQ. NO.	001	
KAI-SIIING TAO,	Defendant.	DECISION + ORDER ON MOTION		
	X			
HON. ANDREW BORROK:				
<u> </u>	nts, listed by NYSCEF document nu , 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29	mber (Motion 001) 8, 9), 10, 11, 12, 13,	
were read on this motion to/f	DISMISS			

Upon the foregoing documents, Kai-Shing Tao's motion to dismiss the complaint must be granted because Digipac, LLC's (**Digipac**) operating agreement (NYSCEF Doc. No. 13) does not provide for an automatic exit option and the operating Agreement otherwise indicated that it superceded any prior or contemporaneous agreement (*id.* at § 13.2). Alan Behler is bound by the operating agreement because he is a member of Digipac (NYSCEF Docs. No. 18-20). It does not matter that he did not sign it (6 Del C § 18-101(9); *See also Seaport Village Ltd v Seaport Village Operating Company, LLC*, 2014 WL 4782817 [Del. Ch. 2014]). In addition, the terms of this alleged oral agreement are unenforceable because they are indefinite and incapable of being enforced. No agreement or formula is alleged as to the terms of any such exit option after the five years the defendant purportedly promised to provide him with an exit strategy (*Marlio v McLaughlin*, 288 AD2d 97, 99 [1st Dept 2001]). The promissory estoppel claim fails because Mr. Behler's reliance on Mr. Tao's alleged promise was unreasonable based on the lack of

652567/2020 BEHLER, ALBERT P. vs. TAO, KAI-SHING Motion No. 001

Page 1 of 2

FILED: NEW YORK COUNTY CLERK 06/09/2022 10:42 AM

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 32

INDEX NO. 652567/2020

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 06/08/2022

definite terms as to any	pur	ported guarantee	d ex	kit strate	gy	. Therefore, the motion	to dismiss
must be granted.							
The Court has considered	ed tl	ne remaining argu	ume	ents and	fiı	nds them unavailing.	
Accordingly, it is							
ORDERED that Kai-Sh	ing	Tao's motion to	disı	miss the	cc	emplaint is granted; and	it is further
ORDERED that the complaint is dismissed.							
				1			
				$\sqrt{\frac{2}{\sqrt{2}}}$	2022	0608171803ABORROKCC9331D086D	≱4677AB BC4E27E5EFEC1 A
6/8/2022 DATE			i	/ 4		ANDREW BORROR	7 180
CHECK ONE:	Х	CASE DISPOSED		ſ		NON-FINAL DISPOSITION	a, J.S.C.
	Х	GRANTED		DENIED		GRANTED IN PART	OTHER
APPLICATION:		SETTLE ORDER				SUBMIT ORDER	

FIDUCIARY APPOINTMENT

CHECK IF APPROPRIATE:

REFERENCE

INCLUDES TRANSFER/REASSIGN